

CLARK COUNTY CLEAN WATER COMMISSION

Wednesday, October 18, 2000
6:00 – 8:30 PM

Clark County Public Works Department
Conference Room
4700 NE 78th Street
Vancouver, Washington

Call to Order

Roll Call:

Commission Members Present

Robert Agard, Willie Bourlet, Cal Ek, Dana Kemper, Mary Martin
Susan Rasmussen, Don Steinke, Art Stubbs and Peter Tuck

County Public Works Staff

Pete Capell, Kelli Frost, Cindy Meats, Earl Rowell and Rod Swanson

Public

William Kravas

Introduction:

The members of the Clean Water Commission, Clark County staff and the public were introduced. Chair Commissioner, Mr. Agard, then called the meeting to order.

Agenda and Material Review:

Mr. Rowell reviewed the material for the meeting.

1. Meeting notes, Wednesday, October 18;
2. Meeting notes, Wednesday, October 4;
3. Amended meeting notes, Wednesday, September 20;
4. Letter to Board of County Commissioners from Mr. Gary O'Connell.
5. Comparison of Clean Water Fee Type III (Multi-family) Fee;
6. WRIA 28, Internet site from Washington Department of Ecology; and
7. Clean Water Program: 2000 Budget (Draft)

Meeting Notes

October 4, 2000:

The notes to the Wednesday, October 4, 2000 meeting were approved as written.

Communication from the public

Letter from Gary O'Connell;

Gary O'Connell, a representative from Quantum residential, wrote a letter to the Board of County Commissioners expressing his disappointment regarding apartment complexes being assessed a clean water fee based on the number of units, than by the square footage of impervious surface. The Board of County Commissioners has asked the Clean Water Commission for a recommendation in response to Mr. O'Connell's letter.

Mr. Bourlet replied that before a recommendation can be made, from the clean water commissioners, they would need a staff report outlining the financial impact of changing the assessment for apartment complexes. Mr. Bourlet also stated that by changing the assessment to square footage of impervious surface, it might encourage builders to build upward, rather than outward.

Mr. Steinke: I agree, I think it is in our best interest to encourage builders to build upward not outward, which could reduce the amount of impervious area. Why did we abandon the square footage assessment, for determining the clean water fee, for apartment complexes, and base it on number of units?

Ms. Martin explained that it was determined that even though there may only be two apartment units, the residences may own more than two vehicles, which would have a greater impact on the roads than a single family residence with fewer vehicles. For the first year, it was decided to bill apartment complexes, a clean water fee based on the number of units.

Ms. Rasmussen: Another reason the clean water fee assessment for apartment complexes was based on the number of units was the cost related, administratively, in determining the square footage of impervious surface.

Mr. Tuck: Maybe it would be more fair to assess base units on the lowest fee value (\$19.80), rather than the highest (\$33.00) because you don't have the maximum impact on the roads, as someone who may live further out in the county who drives farther into town.

Mr. Stubbs: The reason the lower fee was given to those who own acreage was because of the absorption ability of the land.

Unanimously, the Commissioners voted to continue with the current rate structure for apartment complexes, whereby the fee is based on the number of units not impervious surface.

Public Works Director:

Mr. Agard introduced Pete Capell, acting Public Works Director. Mr. Capell welcomed any questions the Commissioners may have.

The Commissioners addressed four concerns to Mr. Capell:

1. Padden expressway at 130th and 142nd, with regards to erosion control.
2. Dollars corner being bare, with no grass growing
3. County vehicles leaking oil onto Mr. Bourlet's driveway.
4. Are County staff following the same rules as other citizens, in regards to clean water and BMPs.
5. Communications between Public Works inspectors and Community Development/code enforcement inspectors

Mr. Capell assured the Commissioners that he would follow through and report back on these concerns.

Luanne Coachman e-mails:

Rod Swanson explained that the issue at hand is the development of the monitoring requirements for the next permit, which will be in draft form, later this year. Department of Ecology is trying to figure out a way to write their permit so that it has guidelines that permittee's are required to follow in regards to monitoring.

Mr. Agard: I brought this up in order to show the different perspectives on what could be done in the future. Also, to provide a background of the rules that we may have to follow under our next permit.

Mr. Bourlet: Does Clark County has an active role in making sure our interests are being heard?

Mr. Ek: My concern is that nothing is happening locally.

Mr. Agard: When is our next permit due?

Mr. Swanson: It should go into effect the middle of next year.

Mr. Stubbs: Are we, the commissioners, required to sign off on this new permit?

Mr. Agard: The new permit will probably come to this commission for review. Mr. Bill Baron will be responsible for signing the new permit.

Mr. Tuck: Does the new permit deal with quantity control?

Mr. Swanson: My understanding is that when they issue the permit they will give the permittee's a certain amount of time to devise a program that is equivalent to the state manual.

Review enforcement letter and citations to date:

Mr. Agard: After reviewing the budget, it was found that there was no reference to the amount of actions taken to date in regards to enforcement and citations to date.

Mr. Kemper: As of yesterday two more \$500 fines were written.

Mr. Rowell: We will gather that information from Marlia Jenkins and provide it at the next clean water meeting, on November 1st.

Mr. Ek: Why are we interested in the enforcement issue?

Mr. Kemper: All money raised from fines is put into a separate fund, which can only be used for capital improvements.

Mr. Tuck: We asked that question at the last meeting, and we were told that the money from fines was put into the general fund.

Mr. Agard: Let's review this issue and put it on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Rowell: I'll follow up with Bronson Potter regarding this matter and report back at the next meeting.

Budget:

The Commissioners spent the remainder of the meeting reviewing the budget. Mr. Rowell handed out to the Commissioners a *preliminary* spreadsheet, which provided a line item description for each of the different program elements within the overall NPDES permit as it relates to the budget. This provided a *draft* line by line program by program cost statement.

Next Steps

Next Meeting:

The Clean Water Commission's next meeting is on Wednesday, November 1, 2000.

Adjourn:

Commissioner Agard adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

H:\rowell\npdes\cwc notes October 18.doc

Respectfully submitted by Kelli Frost